VERMONT SUPERIOR COURT
CIVIL DIVISION
BENNINGTON UNIT

Justin-Ames Gamache v. Lauren Ronan
Case No. 22-ST-00949

NOTICE TO THE COURT REGARDING NON-CONSENT TO DISCLOSURE OF PRIVATE RESIDENTIAL ADDRESS AND PRESERVATION OF OFFICIAL PUBLIC EMAIL SERVICE POSITION

Merged Filing Packet

Document 1: Notice to the Court Regarding Non-Consent to Disclosure of Private Residential Address and Preservation of Official Public Email Service Position

Document 2: Exhibit A - Final Judgment Denying No-Stalking Order

Submitted by:

Justin-Ames Gamache®, M.Ed., M.S., PMCert-ET
Plaintiff, Pro Se

VERMONT SUPERIOR COURT
CIVIL DIVISION
BENNINGTON UNIT

Justin-Ames Gamache v. Lauren Ronan
Case No. 22-ST-00949

NOTICE TO THE COURT REGARDING NON-CONSENT TO DISCLOSURE OF PRIVATE RESIDENTIAL ADDRESS AND PRESERVATION OF OFFICIAL PUBLIC EMAIL SERVICE POSITION

Plaintiff, **Justin-Ames Gamache®, M.Ed., M.S., PMCert-ET**, appearing pro se, respectfully gives notice that the Court does not have Plaintiff's consent, permission, waiver, or authorization to use, disclose, publish, circulate, index, or rely upon Plaintiff's private residential address for any purpose not strictly required by law, court rule, or verified service necessity.

Plaintiff files this Notice to preserve his address privacy, personal safety, identity-protection interests, and objection to any unnecessary exposure of his private residential location in a public-facing court record.

Plaintiff does not consent to any public-facing docket entry, filing, certificate, notice, order, mailing, administrative action, or third-party-accessible record that exposes, repeats, republishes, or enables reverse-address identification of Plaintiff's private residence.

Plaintiff's private residence is not a litigation contact point, public identifier, waiver instrument, or substitute for lawful service through the least intrusive available procedural method.

Plaintiff further gives notice that an officer of the law who uses, publishes, provides, or operates through a taxpayer-funded public agency email address does not occupy the same privacy posture as a private residential address holder.

Vermont law defines a "public record" or "public document" as written or recorded information, regardless of physical form or characteristics, that is produced or acquired in the course of public agency business.

A public officer's official government email address, when used for public agency business or official communication, exists within a public-business framework that is legally distinct from Plaintiff's private residential address.

Plaintiff does not consent to the inversion of that distinction by treating official email communication to a public officer as private residential contact while simultaneously exposing Plaintiff's private residence to public indexing or reverse-location identification.

Use of a public officer's official government email address for litigation notice, procedural communication, or service-related transmission cannot fairly be transformed into private residential contact, stalking conduct, harassment, or abuse of process merely because the public officer is also an opposing party.

The final judgment in the underlying no-stalking matter denied the no-stalking order, vacated any temporary order previously issued, entered judgment for Justin-Ames Gamache, and closed the case.

That final disposition is material because it prevents the improper use of a closed and adjudicated no-stalking matter to recharacterize official case-related communication to a public officer's public email address as continuing stalking-related conduct.

The Court's later entry addressed the method of service under Vermont's electronic-filing framework, not any factual finding that Plaintiff engaged in unlawful private contact.

The Court stated that because Plaintiff had elected to file electronically, service should have been made through File and Serve rather than by direct email absent an agreement for alternative service.

Vermont Rule of Civil Procedure 5 recognizes that service after commencement must comply with Rule 5 procedures, and Vermont's electronic-filing amendments direct electronic filers to the Vermont Rules for Electronic Filing where electronic filing has commenced.

The 2020 Vermont Rules for Electronic Filing identify the electronic filing system as the primary service method between electronic filers unless the applicable rules or an agreement permit another method.

The Vermont Judiciary's eFiling guidance likewise explains that service through the eFiling system requires use of "eFile and Serve" or "Serve," and that selecting "eFile" alone does not complete service.

Accordingly, any dispute over Plaintiff's use of a public officer's official government email address is, at most, a procedural service-method issue under Rule 5 and Rule 11.

It is not evidence of improper private contact, unlawful conduct, stalking conduct, harassment, abuse of process, consent to disclose Plaintiff's private address, or waiver of Plaintiff's residential privacy.

The lawful remedy for a disputed service method is procedural correction, not the conversion of Plaintiff's private residential address into a public record marker, service target, searchable identifier, or reverse-address exposure mechanism.

Plaintiff therefore preserves the distinction between a public officer's official government email address used for public-business communication and Plaintiff's private residential address, which Plaintiff does not consent to disclose, publish, index, repeat, or use except as strictly required by law.

Plaintiff further preserves all objections to unnecessary residential-address exposure, reverse-address identification, public docket dissemination, third-party indexing, data-broker capture, and any treatment of Plaintiff's private home address as a public litigation contact point.

Plaintiff requests that any future notice, service issue, filing issue, or procedural communication be handled through the least intrusive lawful means available, including the electronic filing system, court-approved service methods, official public contact channels, or other lawful procedures that do not expose Plaintiff's private residence.

Nothing in this Notice should be construed as refusal to comply with lawful court process, lawful service rules, or court-approved procedural requirements.

Plaintiff remains willing to comply with lawful, rule-based, non-abusive procedural requirements while preserving his objection to unnecessary disclosure of his private residential address.

This Notice is submitted to prevent the improper conversion of Plaintiff's private residential address into a public instrument of exposure when official, procedural, and less intrusive alternatives exist.

Respectfully submitted,

Justin-Ames Gamache®, M.Ed., M.S., PMCert-ET
Plaintiff, Pro Se

EXHIBIT A

Final Judgment Denying No-Stalking Order

Lauren Ronan v. Justin Gamache
Case No. 22-ST-00891
Vermont Superior Court, Civil Division, Bennington Unit

VERMONT SUPERIOR COURT
Bennington Unit
207 South St
Bennington VT 05201
802-447-2700
\V\Vw.vermontjudiciary.org

CIVIL DIVISION
Case No. 22-ST-00891

Lauren Ronan v. Justin Gamache

Plaintiff	DOB	Defendant	DOB
Lauren A Ronan	07/25/1988	Justin A Gamache	

FINAL JUDGMENT DENYING NO-STALKING ORDER

The court held a hearing on Plaintiff's request for a no-stalking order against Defendant. Based upon the evidence presented and for reasons set forth in a separate written opinion of today's date, the court concluded that Plaintiff failed to prove her claim. Therefore, the court hereby vacates any temporary order it previously issued, enters judgment for Defendant, and closes the case.

Electronically Signed 9/7/2022 8:38 AM pursuant to V.R.E.F. 9(d)

John W. Valente
Superior Court Judge

Vermont Superior Court
Filed 09/07/22
Bennington Unit